NOT TO BE ISSUED OUT
WITHOUT PERMISSION.

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018

EARLY HISTORY

OF THE

CHINESE CIVILISATION.

A LECTURE

BY

TERRIEN de LACOUPERIE, M.R.A.S.,

de la Société Asiatique de Paris, &c., &c.

WITH PLATE.

LONDON:
E. VATON, 168, FLEET STREET, E.C.
1880.

TO

COLONEL H. YULE, C.B., V.P.R.A.S.,

AND

ROBERT K. DOUGLAS, OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM, AND

PROFESSOR OF CHINESE AT KING'S COLLEGE,

THE FOLLOWING PAGES ARE RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED.

00032322

PREFACE.

With the exception of the last few pages, the following paper appeared in the *Journal of the Society of Arts* for July 16th, 1880. The novelty and importance of the linguistic facts and suggestions contained in it will be deemed a sufficient justification for its publication in a separate form. Put in a few words, these, and an abundance of others which will shortly be adduced in support of them, prove an unmistakeable affinity between the languages and traditions of ancient China and of Babylonia, and thus throw to the ground the barrier which has been supposed to separate the people and language of China from the rest of the world.

Mons. Terrien de Lacouperie's patient and critical study of the old Chinese characters and their sounds has led him to conclusions as to their history which have been concealed from other sinologists. The early use of the ku-wan as phonetic characters, and the recurrence to the hieroglyphic form in the construction of the Ta chuen, are striking linguistic facts, and are so contrary to the ordinary principles of the growth of writing, that it needs the support of the historical

explanation which Mons. Terrien de Lacouperie is able to adduce to gain for them acceptance.

Chinese has hitherto been studied as the purely indigenous growth of the country in which it is now spoken. Mons. Terrien de Lacouperie's researches have widened its field, and have brought it within the range of comparative philology. Much yet remains to be done in this new branch of study, but the following paper forms a noteworthy starting point in the consideration of one of the most important linguistic discoveries of the age.

ROBERT K. DOUGLAS.

British Museum, July 21, 1880.

EARLY HISTORY

OF THE

CHINESE CIVILISATION.

In coming before you this evening, to discuss the Chinese and their history, both primitive and future, I should feel I was exceeding my powers, had I an audience less intelligent than the one whose kindly attention I now claim.

It is neither of philosophy nor of politics I have to deal, though the events now occurring in the far East are likely to have no small influence on the interests of Western Europe. When we speak of the Chinese, of their language, of their habits, of their necessities, we seldom remember that we are speaking of a third part of the whole human race. Attempts have been made to upset this statement; it has been argued that the approximate calculations on which it is based are erroneous; but, after all, we are forced to admit a total varying from 400 to 420 millions of human beings. This colossal agglomeration is cemented solely by traditions growing weaker every day. If in place of a fictitious army of 250,000 men, which is nothing more than a militia or a police, the nation was organised like the great military powers of Europe, its ruler would have under him an army of ten millions. The Chinese, too, has the qualities required for a good soldier, he is courageous, strong, sober, and patient; he respects constituted authority; he requires nothing but discipline and capable officers. I need not repeat, what must be well known to

those present, the early history of China, with the incessant struggles, successful and unsuccessful, against neighbouring races, from the time of the arrival of the Hundred Families on the banks of the Yellow and Blue Rivers, down to our own times; nor need I dwell on the struggles of the race against climate and other natural hardships —struggles which have produced a race such as it is to-day. These matters have been treated in a masterly way by that illustrious traveller and geographer, the Baron Richthofen, who has, unfortunately, not yet found an English translator. It would take me too far from my subject, also, if I were to remind you of the great, yet unexplained, laws which govern the great movements of the human race. The Italian writer, Ferrari, has shown that these laws may be observed acting as regularly in the history of Chinese growth and development as in the Western world, and that the moment has now arrived when we may expect a great change in the empire. It is not, as a great thinker has said, religion, or philosophy, or race, or climate, or social conditions, which affect most powerfully the history of the human race; it is instinct, the unconscious genius of the race.

My object is to show you, by the results of some recent investigations, that the ordinary opinion which would regard China as a world by itself—with a distinct language, and a peculiar way of writing which it has invented for itself—is incorrect, and is based on insufficient study.

One of the most serious obstacles which has hindered European scholars from becoming accurately acquainted with the position held by the Chinese people in relation to other nations, is the extraordinary aspect of the language, the extreme complications of its written vocabulary, accompanied by a not less remarkable poverty in the words as uttered. To a European, the Chinese language is one of the most difficult in the world. The general belief that the language is a rich one is founded on the fact that its characters amount to about 80,000 (of which nearly half will be found in the great dictionary of Kang-hi), each conception, or each idea, being expressed by a par-

ticular character. The difficulty, in this view, would only lie in the multiplicity of written signs; yet this mode of regarding the matter is not the correct one.

The number of characters that we meet with in Chinese books is limited enough; in fact, it may perhaps be estimated at about 8,000. But a large part of these characters have a plurality of significations, which depend upon their combination with other characters, upon the branch of science of which the work treats, as also upon the period when the same was written.

For instance, the character *shi* means "really;" yet, in botanical works, this same hieroglyphic denotes the "seed of plants." In order to understand Chinese books, a knowledge of characters taken singly will not suffice; their position must also be taken into consideration, as well as their combination with other characters.

In dictionaries, for instance, one finds *fú*, "to help, to assist," and *ma*, "a horse." But *fuma* does not, as might be thought, mean a "helping horse;" in Chinese historical books these two characters are always used to denote "the son-in-law of the Emperor." Thus Tamerlane is known in Chinese history as *Teimuk Fuma*.

Chinese literature is very rich in combinations of this kind, and in sentences composed of two or more characters; in most cases, their individual signification does not serve to show us the meaning of the whole. It is a vain task to search for these through dictionaries; the greater number of them, although often unknown to European students, have been handed down by tradition to the Chinese of to-day, with whom these expressions are become so familiar, that they have deemed it superfluous to put them in their dictionaries. A Chinese dictionary in a European language, with a complete collection of phrases, has long been a desideratum; that this is so, is partly due to the vastness of such an undertaking. The *Syllabic Dictionary*, published four years ago by the learned Dr. Wells Williams, has, in a measure, filled this gap; so, too, has the "Chinese-Russian Lexicon," which M. Wassilief, a scholar of great distinction, has just issued. There

are two grave difficulties that translators from the Chinese text have to overcome. One of these is the possible confusion of Chinese signs used phonetically for the transcription of proper names, and apart from all signification, with the other characters which express the meaning of the sentence. All the characters taken by themselves have some meaning attached to them, and it is often difficult for a European scholar, unless he have the help of a native, to distinguish characters by which sounds only are represented from those which have to be translated.

Another difficulty for the European reader of Chinese texts is caused by the utter absence in Chinese of any system of punctuation like ours. There are certain characters which mark the close of sentences, but they are rarely employed, and, generally, a whole chapter is without sub-division of any kind, so that the reader has to settle the punctuation for himself as he goes on. And there is no need to search for examples in our own alphabetical languages to show that an error in punctuation may change the entire meaning of a sentence, or even of a whole chapter; and, therefore, it is wise to consult, as much as possible, Japanese editions, which do use punctuation.

It was not till after European scholars had studied this curious language for two centuries, that it was first shown (by the Rev. J. Edkins), in a remarkable paper published in China, how much help could be gained by comparison of dialects, and by other means, in demonstrating the modifications through which Chinese words have passed. But before entering into this important question, it will be necessary for me to mention two works of vastly different sizes (folio and duodecimo), both published rather more than a couple of centuries ago.

In 1667, there appeared at Amsterdam the voluminous folio by P. Kircher, on "China, as illustrated by its Monuments," published in Latin, of which a French version was shortly afterwards issued. The only important difference between the two editions was the addition of a Chinese-French

vocabulary, the Chinese words being given without the characters, and with the Portuguese spelling adopted at Macao. This was, as I believe, the first one ever published; for that reason I have thought it of sufficient interest to mention it. The work by P. Kircher is not so wholly undeserving of attention as might be imagined from his questionable reputation. His descriptions of Chinese manners and customs are borrowed from the accounts given by the Jesuits, and are, so far, not without value. It is what he has himself added that calls for criticism, such as illustrations evidently taken from description, and not drawn on the spot. But the most singular chapter to examine is the one that treats of Chinese writing, since it is responsible for errors which have been repeated again and again as to the history of Chinese writing and the origin of the Chinese characters.

Calligraphy has always been held by the Chinese in high esteem; and their annals commemorate men who are famous for their skill with the hair-pencil. But apart from the characters in their regular shape, there are certain fanciful forms which the Chinese have always highly admired in proportion as the calligrapher's talent enabled him, without departing from the classic outline, to give to some, or even to every character the semblance of an ear of corn, a leaf, a bird, a dragon, a fish, a tortoise, or a star. The method of fantastic lettering, which we may often notice on shop-fronts in Europe, is something of the same kind. Now, the fourteen or fifteen series of characters, of which P. Kircher gives the figures, are only specimens of these fanciful eccentricities; yet he has put them forward, arranged according to the objects depicted, as if they formed so many categories of pictorial writing, which have become the origin of the modern characters. This error of the learned Jesuit, who was one of the notable men of his day, shows us how dangerous it is to touch upon such questions without the requisite knowledge.

Two years after the publication of Kircher's work, there appeared in this country a volume by John Webb, of Berkshire, putting forward a notion

which has held its ground more or less to our own day. The author's theory is at once shown by the following title chosen for his learned little book:—"An Historical Essay on the Probability that the Language of the Empire of China is the Primitive Language." Nine years later, the book was re-issued with a new title-page; the text, however, remained unchanged.

In 1787, as though this name of Webb was to be identified with the study of Chinese, one Daniel Webb issued a little work, entitled "Some Reasons for thinking that the Greek Language was borrowed from the Chinese, in Notes on the Grammatica Sinica of M. Fourmont."

I do not think it is necessary to detain you by pointing out the fallacy of both these theories. There would be nothing to choose between them, were it not that the multiplicity of uses to which Chinese words have been put, through their paucity, has been made an argument in speculations on the primitive monosyllabism of speech, of which Chinese has been quoted as a crystallised example.

The serious enfeeblement of the Chinese phonetic system, the decayed state of the vocables, the small variety of sounds to which they have been reduced, in contrast to the vast number of the signs used to express them, with a tenfold multiplication of meaning, all this has rendered it possible to find an apparent consonance with almost any monosyllable of another language. Such was the mistake of Klaproth, when he compiled the memoir, which he called "Hic et Ubique; Vestiges de la Langue Primitive retrouvée dans le Chinois;" and such also has been the mistake of many other minds nearer our own time. But the state of things is entirely different when you deal with Chinese vocables as they were before the Christian era, and when the subjects of comparison are vocables containing two consonants, in which there is much less chance of delusive coincidences.

The sources to which we may have recourse in tracing the phonetic variations through which the Chinese language has passed in the course of ages, are numerous, and of very different kinds. But

they belong to a series of facts which it is a difficult and delicate task to establish, and which demands from the investigator both sober erudition and acumen, unless he would see the whole apparatus that he has erected with so much time and labour turned against himself and the result he aims at.

These facts come from different quarters, and may be thus summarised :—

1. The Tonic dictionaries of the Chinese.

2. The Buddhist transcripts of Sanskrit terms.

3. Modern Chinese dialects.

4. The more ancient extra-Chinese dialects and modes of pronunciation; such as the Japanese *Go-on* and *Kan-on;* the two Sino-Corean dialects; the Annamite form of Chinese.

5. The phonetic symbols used since the 2nd century B.C., in newly formed characters.

6. Rhymes in the old poems.

7. The study of the writing called *Ku-wen*, anterior to the 9th century B.C.

8. The employment of certain characters in the classics and elsewhere, with a signification different from their ideographic value, a signification which through the changes of pronunciation they have not preserved.

9. The mute letters (excluding prefixes) and in general the spelling used in Tibetan.

10. The equivalent words in Taï (Siamese, &c.), Burmese, Annamite, and several other languages.

11. Equivalent words in the Ural-Altaic languages.

This is indeed a great puzzle—the task of recovering the ancient pronunciation—but it is impossible for me to enter here upon the details obtained from the sources which I have just indicated, and through which we are enabled to recognise the great changes that have occurred in the words since the days of old. I will quote but one example. In the year A.D. 65, the Emperor Ming-Ti sent for Buddhist priests to teach the doctrines which have gathered round the legend of Sakyamuni. In the Chinese texts, the Sanskrit name of the chief of the two priests who arrived is transcribed in four charac-

ters, which to-day are pronounced as *Kia-ye-mo-tang*. Now, if we consult that Chinese dialect which has most preserved traces of the archaic phonetism, we find these same four words to be pronounced as *Ka dziep ma tang*, which is almost identical with the Sanskrit *Kaçyapa Matanga*.

The transcription of proper names, and of a certain number of the sacred words of Buddhist literature, form one of the safest methods of this kind of restoration. But even these cannot be used without discrimination, for the transcripts have been made during a space of more than 1,000 years, during which thousands of books were translated in different provinces, and, consequently, under the influence of different provincial dialects, and subject as well to the general modifications of language through that long space of years.

And I may say that if the study of these transcripts has not hitherto produced any sufficient result, it is because no proper account has been taken of these differences; they have, in fact, been regarded as mere irregularities, due, most frequently, to the deficiencies of the translator. I may cite an example from the great compilation which caused so many years of toil to the greatest translator from the Chinese yet known in Europe—I mean the lamented Stanislas Julien—the "Méthode de déchiffrer et transcrire les Noms Sanskrits qui se rencontrent dans les Livres Chinois, inventée et demontrée." In this compilation, which no one could have produced who did not possess the physical vigour of its author, examples are derived from every century and every locality without any suggestion of those causes of difference which we have indicated. And thus it is that the exceptions are more in number than the instances that follow the rules, and the student is candidly invited to choose that result which best suits his object.

The Chinese form of writing, as used in printed books, the *Kiai-shu* of the present day (allowing for certain improvements added under the Sung dynasty about the 10th century) dates from the 4th century of our era, but no farther back. It is composed of 103 different elements or strokes, the-

position of which was an imitation of the more rounded and thicker writing, called *Li-shu*, modified by the rapidity of execution, which had become possible through the improvements in the apparatus of the scribe, viz., his paper and hair pencil. The *Li-shu* had been the official text since the days of the T'sin dynasty, at which time it was devised through the necessity for a uniform system throughout the empire. This, again, had been preceded by the *Siao-chuen*, a character composed of meagre and monotonous strokes such as were adapted to the materials then in use, viz., a bamboo written on with a *stylus*. This, again, was an official modification, originating in the same desire for uniformity, which had been attempted in the reign of the great Shi-Hoang of the T'sin. The *Siao-chuen* had been modified from the ancient mode of writing called *Ta-chuen*, in which great variations had developed themselves among the different States (independent, eventually, rather than feudatory) which had had once been subject to the ancient dominion of the Chœu; but the amount of modification had been great, and the attempt failed in its aim. Now, from these successive official changes came a great number of alterations in the elements of the characters intended to make them answer more exactly to their signification as shaped by the ideas then dominant, and, by the systematic interpretation, more or less in vogue; the addition in compound characters of a considerable number of determinative ideographic elements without affecting the sound; all leaving their stamp on the composition of the characters in use. Now, it is this stamp which, for many years—I must not say for centuries—has been a clog on the steps of European students in their efforts to investigate the true nature of Chinese writing.

The doctrines on the nature and formation of the symbols used in Chinese writing, as they have been hitherto accepted and taught, in accordance with the views of native scholars, rest, for the most part, on a very fragile foundation, and one need not fear to be accused of rashness in saying that they are destined to go through very profound

modifications under the processes of European criticism.

The accepted interpretation of the famous formula, *Luh-shu*, which forms the basis of the system, is, by the admission of the Chinese literati themselves, a comparatively late one. We must not confound the explanation and commentaries upon commentaries, of which it has been the object, with the formula itself. The latter is already mentioned in the 11th century B.C., but I myself believe it to be much older than that, and I think I see in it, with the group of legendary circumstances which gather round the single word *Lok* (by turns indicating book, river, horse, or dragon), the extension of a tradition vastly more ancient, probably of foreign origin, and common to other nations of the highest antiquity. But full of interest as such an inquiry would be, this is not the place to enter on a question requiring so much detail.

The explanation of the *Luh-shu* is supplied to us only by the scholars and philosophers of the Han period, and it is not easy for us to judge to what extent they were the echo of older tradition. But in any case, if we examine the two oldest lists, that furnished by Pan-ku, the historian of the First Han, and that of Hü-shen, in the introduction to his famous dictionary, the Shwo-wen, and that of Ching-tong, the oldest commentator of the Chœu-li, we shall not find that their explanations, however they may be akin to one another, have that identity which we should expect if those explanations had before the age of these writers, attained to that degree of system and fixity which belongs to such an established doctrine as tradition ascribes to them. Their differences, in fact, have a real importance, for they mark an epoch during which the sages of China occupied themselves with the interpretation of the *Luh-shu*, without being able to agree upon it, and thus we find a justification for the view current in later centuries, and expressed in the words that "the students of the time of the Han knew the characters but not the sounds."

This was well understood by that learned Egyptologist, the late Mr. C. W. Goodwin, carried

off by death soon after his arrival in China. In the only article, or note rather, so far as I know, published by him, on this subject, in which he took a brief interest, he refused to believe that the Chinese writings had been always composed on the principles taught now-a-days; he refused to believe (*e.g.*) that the character *siang*, composed of two hieroglyphs, one of them "tree," *muh*, and the other "eye" *muh*, could signify "mutually," and be pronounced as *Siang!* Had it been permitted him to pursue his investigations, and to study the ancient forms of writing, he would certainly have discovered that which I am now endeavouring to elucidate.

The legend of the *Luh-shu*, as "Six-Writings," which has taken shape purely from the interpretations and systematisings of the philosophers of the Han, and which has been so great a stumbling-block to the true understanding of the composition of the characters, assuredly had its source in an ancient recollection brought to China by the "Hundred Families." The old legends of Chaldæa are filled with the six manifestations of the Divinity, which, doubtless, corresponded to the number of the sacred books in which the priests beheld the most complete exposition of the revealed law.

The mode of writing called *ta-chuen*, of which we have stated that the *siao-chuen* was a systematic reduction, in conformity with a canon of a certain number of strokes (or elements), was formed by the historiographer, Shœ Chœu, by order of King Suen, one of the greatest monarchs of the Chœu dynasty. This prince's intention (which failed through the weakness of his successor) was by presenting this system to the feudatory States, to restrain the disorder which the absence of any sufficient powerful centre of literary unity had suffered to arise in the use of the written characters, which was then almost entirely phonetic, and thus necessarily followed the dialectic variations of the different principalities. In this undertaking the written character was reconstructed as one of hieroglyphics. This event in the history of writing, of which the importance is unmistakable, but which has never, till now, been pointed out,

had no small influence on the destinies of the Celestial Empire. It was imitated at a later date, though on a smaller scale, as we have already mentioned. If it has, in truth, aided the spread of the Chinese power, and facilitated its maintenance over a too vast area, it has, at the same time, been a clog, so far as its action could go, upon its development, in the sense in which this expression is understood among the higher races, to whose progress the possession of an alphabet, a thing rendered impossible by this event among the Chinese, has contributed so immensely.

Shœ Chœu, ill-omened genius that he was, made it his object to choose, whenever it was possible, characters that symbolised objects in harmony with their significations as these were understood by him under the prejudices of his age and surroundings, to render these characters, by some modifications of, or addition to, the strokes as much as possible images. And when the newly mixed outline of the sign of any idea was not enough of an image to be understood without the pronunciation belonging to it (which was only limited to some dialect or other), he attached an additional figurative sign. The phonetic principles which evidently guided him in the selection of characters, both figurative and otherwise, have not come down to us, although at a date after the "burningof the books," there appears in a catalogue a treatise on writing bearing his name, which has since disappeared in one or other of the literary catastrophes of the great Empire. However, after the examination of the characters which he had formed, it would seem that he endeavoured with care, and often with success, to group two homophones in such a way that one of the elements, simple or compound, of a word-group should mark plainly, by its particular phonetic value, the official pronunciation attached to the object indicated by the whole complex symbol.

Let us remember, in apology for this remarkable man, that the ancient traditions regarding the process by which the characters were formed were no longer generally known, and that in some of the States, viz., those in which literary culture was

least developed, they could only imitate the ancient outlines without understanding them. And this we are able to discern by comparative study of the ancient inscriptions, even in spite of the mist of 3,000 years that separates us from those times.

As an instance of the method of Shœ Chœu, to indicate the value "earth," he found that the old sign, *t'u*, was not sufficiently intelligible, so he added *tun*, indicating "an earthen dyke," as suggestive of "earth."

In complex characters, when this same character *t'u* played the part of an ideograph or a phonetic sign, it was replaced by *fou*, "hill," which appeared to him more suggestive than the old one.

The modern character (Kiai-shu) can, therefore, only be a stumbling block in the study of the ancient word-characters. When the old elements composing them have not been intentionally changed or modified in the transition of styles, they are, for the most part, blind imitations. Thus it may be affirmed, without hesitation, that the modern Chinese is, orthographically, a mere phantom of the ancient.

But to resume; we should not expect to find in the modern Chinese character (which in its present form is no older than the 4th century of our era) the exact reproduction—exigencies of style excepted—of the ancient orthography, did we bear in mind that the modern character was only formed after several successive and systematic modifications. These modifications were called for partly by political exigencies requiring an ideographic uniformity of character comprehensible in the different dialectal districts of the Empire, partly in accordance with philosophical speculations for which the old phonetic expressions were insufficient, partly again by the improvement in writing materials.

The archaic character is composed of a certain number of hieroglyphic signs, of which the symbolic value has, in many cases, been preserved, while in another considerable class of examples, this signification has been lost, and appears never to have been known by the Chinese. In fact, although their hieroglyphic origin cannot be matter of slightest

doubt, their value as symbols had been lost at a period anterior to the oldest records or traditions of Chinese culture.

Besides the foregoing, the characters included a certain number of signs without any possible explanation, and known only by their phonetic value and significations traditionally attributed to them. All these symbols, by their double, sometimes triple combinations, formed a supplementary class of complex signs, amounting, according to prevalent tradition, to a general total of 540. But as the object of an ideographic sign often has several designations, the supplementary sign served as its phonetic complement, enabling the reader to recognise which pronunciation was to be employed in each individual case. This enables us to establish a basis of comparison between a number of different uses of the same symbol.

For the present, it will suffice to give you a few specimens, illustrations, and examples of the old system of phonetic transcription completely forgotten for more than 3,000 years, even in the countries where it was practised.

We now reach the most curious fact of our investigations, and which, I hope, you will listen to patiently, laying aside all preconceptions as to the peculiar originality of the Chinese language and nation; as to their self-contained development in isolation, from all the other civilisation of the world; and as to the notion that China is a world by itself, which has independently originated the arts, the sciences, and the written character which it possesses.

The detailed exposition of the researches undertaken by me during many years, guided by the methods of modern linguistic science in this unexplored dominion, would be beyond the limits of the present paper, and I can only ask your indulgence for a summary of the results.

These researches have been supplemented by the written character from its last transformation in the 4th century of our era back to the most ancient graphic written monuments; the study of native works on phonetism, of ancient rhymes and dialects; the transliteration of proper names at different

periods; and by the comparison of the vocabulary of modern dialects, whether within or without China proper, a comparison which has been extended, first to cognate languages, according to their degree of relationship and the greater or less degree in which they have participated in Chinese literary culture, and then to more remote idioms, according to the importance of the affinity with Chinese which they present.

These studies have led me to recognise in the Chinese spoken language, excessively attenuated as it is now, and disguised by the influence of idioms belonging to a different morphology and ideology, an ancient member of the great family of agglutinant languages, known as *Ural-Altaic*. And in doing so, it may be necessary to establish a third division of that family's group which has been provisionally constituted by recent discoveries, and which might appropriately be called Amardian; a group in which the first division embraces Akkadian and its dialect, and the second division proto-medic, Susian, and Kossian.

It was necessary to disregard at the remote epoch in the history of spoken Chinese with which we have dealt, its characteristic phenomenon of *Sheng*, improperly called musical intonations, owing to their being of subsequent date. These *Sheng*, so strange to our ears, accustomed to the *recto tono* languages, have affected in different degrees a certain number of the languages of the extreme East more or less related to Chinese, in which, as also in the Chinese, they have reduced the words to a relative and modern monosyllabism. This phenomenon is found also, but in a less degree, save perhaps, in Houzouana, in many African dialects, where it has produced the same result. The more immediate cause of its existence has been, and still is, among the languages in which it is now found, the natural compensation necessary to counterbalance the contractions, aphaereses and apocopes, according to the genius of the dialects, the simple or compound vocables of which have been affected by that muscular sloth which is the particular disgrace of those races, but which acts in accordance with the

ideological sense of the speech of those who make use of them.

Having thus recognised the part played by the *Sheng* in the history of those languages now known as *vario tono*, let us recur to spoken Chinese for the purpose of mentioning certain peculiarities of phoneticism which it shares with the Amardian division of the great family above referred to, and which, coupled with its ideological characteristics, place it as a link between that division and the Ugro-Finnish group.

It is impossible for me, without trespassing on your patience, to enter into the minute and numerous details respecting the decay of letters, the varieties of pronunciation, and the choice of certain articulations, which closely connect ancient Chinese with the Akkadian and Susian dialects, and not with the Ugro-Finnish tongues, with which, on the other hand, it shares certain very marked grammatical affinities. I cannot do better than show you here the resemblances between the Chinese and Amardian vocabularies by citing, from a list of upwards of many hundred examples, a few words common to ancient Chinese and Akkadian:—

	Akkadian.	Chinese.
To shine	mul	mut
To purify	lakh	luk
Region	ub	ip
White	par	bak
Cloth	sik	sik
Strength	'sur	sek
Write	sar	suk
Right hand	zag	dzek
Book, writing	kiu	king
To know	zu	si(t
To destroy	zir	dzok
To die	mit	mut
To give	sim	seng
Horn	'si	tse
Weak	sig	dek
Full, complete	sig	sik
Variegated	dar	dok
To grow	dar	dœk, dok
Hero	dun	tan

	Akkadian.	Chinese.
Leaf	dub	dep, tap
Tablet, to write		
Knee	dugu	dok
Vase	duk	tuk
Lord	elim	lang
Man	erim	
Prince	khan	kan
Woman	rak	nok, luk
Settlement	pin	pin
Mother	umuk	muk
Mouth	ka	ko
Door	kâ	ga
The earth	kia	kai
Under	kita	get
Earth, country	kiengi	kien kai
To eat	ku	ki(t?
To be high	kuga	kok
Slave	pakh, nar	pok, nok
Sunrise	kun	kan
Earth, country	kur	kok
Favour	kur	kuk
Fish	kha	gu
Cloud	gan	gun
Curved	gam	gam
Black	gik, mi	kek, mi
Son, little	du, tur	tak
One	it	it
Cow	lu lub	lup
Brick	ku	ku
Judge	dî	ti
Hundred	me	be
Eye	si, mat	si, mut

It seems to me unnecessary to draw your attention to the peculiarities of primitive hieroglyphicism, of polyphony, of the system of phonetic complement, and, at the same time, of the relative age of the archaic writing of the Celestial Empire, at the period of its first introduction, when one can compare them with like peculiarities observable in the earliest cuneiform inscriptions, with which we have become familiar through the discoveries made in the field of Assyriology, of which the distinguished scholar, Sir Henry Rawlinson, is the creator and the chief.

No more doubts exist in respect to the cuneiform

32322

characters than in the case of Chinese signs, that they have degenerated from ancient hieroglyphics; but the outline of the ancient images is, in the cuneiform, far more obliterated in consequence of the peculiar and inexplicable form of the cuneiform strokes in which, from the earliest times, they were imitated. In spite of this, the images are yet occasionally recognisable, and some help may be derived, although not in an absolute manner, from the linear outlines of these same characters which, however, ought not to be regarded in the same way as their graphic precursors, since they, at times, give evidence of a greater corruption of the primitive image than the archaic cuneiform outline. The cause of the preference shown for a linear outline, in the last case, should probably be attributed to the hardness of the substance upon which they were engraved with greater facility than the cuneiform strokes, which, on the contrary, were more easily impressed on tablets of unbaked clay.

We must always remember, however, that the fact that the earliest characters were a combination of linear and cuneiform strokes, shows that the primitive outlines were made by joined lines, and it was thus, doubtless, that the writing on bamboo, papyrus, or ölet, which preceded the use of the clay, was tried. But, however that may have been, and although the number of the signs of which the hieroglyphic value is now known is small, and yields but a limited field for comparison, the resemblance between these hieroglyphics and those that have been preserved in China is very striking, and indicates, without doubt, a community of origin. The identity of outline, as far as it is possible to recognise it, the identity of sound and of meaning, and the common possession of the same polyphonic values, can but point to one conclusion. We should also remark a characteristic of this hieroglyphic writing, and which distinguishes it from that of ancient Egypt. It is that in China, as in Chaldea, the images are drawn full face, whereas, in Egypt, they are shown in profile. Undoubtedly there is an importance to be attached to this peculiarity.

Let us take some instances of resemblance between the two writings, and compare the linear

or the archaic cuneiform outline of Babylon, with the Chinese Ku-wen. Apart from this test, there are reasons for believing that the cuneiform writing was not always arranged in horizontal lines. Without mentioning the peculiar arrangement of the characters in some of the most ancient seals, which seem to lend themselves easier to a vertical than to a horizontal system of writing, and without the additional fact that the early writers on stone wrote horizontally, we shall notice, with the eminent A. H. Sayce, that a greater part of the images which seem as though, ideographically, they should be considered upright, are written horizontally in the linear form of inscription.

The following are some hieroglyphics that are common to both writings: — "Eye," "moon," "augur," "north," "divining-rods," "race," "family," "tongue," "slave," "black," "region," "protection," "settlement," "brick," "bull," "rope," &c.

It will be noticed that we have avoided comparing the signs meaning "mouth," "sun," "star," "moon," "tree," and others of the same kind, which could not be represented, excepting in the same manner, and consequently would be without value for comparison.

These resemblances in sound and in words, and this identity of original writing, are only of marked value where supported by like affinities in the literature, and in the traditions. Of this we will proceed to give proof.

The Yh-King is, *par excellence*, the holy book of Chinese literature. I cannot better describe it than by quoting the recent description given of it by the learned professor, who has so kindly offered to preside here this evening: —

"Among the most valued works of antiquity stands the 'Yih-King,' the original text of which consists of short sentences, arranged under certain diagrams, formed by the combination of straight lines, and is attributed to the legendary Emperor Fuh-he (B.C. 2852). But, whoever may have been the author of this text, its antiquity is undoubted, as is incidentally shown by the increasing inability of the successive early commentators —Wan Wang (B.C. 1150), Chow Kung (B.C. 1120), and Confucius (B.C. 500)—to understand its drift. "If I

had 50 more years to live I would devote them to the study of the 'Yih-King,'' said Confucius, as he laid down his pencil at the completion of his commentary on that work, in which, however, he professed to find an unfathomable abyss of philosophical learning and divinatory lore. The superstitious fame which the sage thus established for it saved it from the *auto-da-fé* in which perished (221 B.C.) the entire literature current in the northern portions of the empire, except such works as treated of medicine, divination, and husbandry. Since that time, the foremost scholars of each generation have edited the text, and heaped commentary after commentary upon it, and one and all have arrived at the somewhat lame conclusion, that its full significance is past finding out. In the same way, a host of European Chinese scholars have made translations of the work, and have, if possible, made confusion more confounded. The text, as we have it at the present day, is very corrupt, owing to the fact that it was re-written at least three times, at the three great official modifications of the characters referred to above, at each of which it suffered mutilations at the hands of the transcribers, who introduced changes in the ideographic value of the characters to suit the philosophical views prevailing at the time, and in the phonetic values of others, in accordance with the peculiarities of the existing official dialects. But in spite of these difficulties, the knowledge possessed by M. Terrien de La Couperie of the ancient sounds of the language and of ethnological science, has enabled him to raise the veil from the 'Yih-King,' which has resisted the searching gaze of 30 centuries of native scholarship, and to foreshadow the true nature of the work."

According to the necessarily brief examination given by us to the two chapters which we have completely translated, and which are of a like character, the Yh-King would seem to be an agglomeration of very ancient documents. Out of the chapters that we have translated, the 22nd and the 30th are simply lists of meanings of the hieroglyphic placed at the head of the chapter. These lists are drawn up with care, and seem to have been made systematically as vocabularies; and in order to give the precise meaning, the author has occasionally been at pains to show the significations expressed by homophones, which should not be attributed to the sign which is the object of

the chapter. Without being as yet in a position to affirm this positively, we think that, at least, half of the book is composed of such lists. Certain of the chapters relate to the early populations of primitive China, of which the name and the particulars are recognisable. Some seem specially effected to certain categories of objects, the different kinds of which are indicated; some treat of certain customs; some, again, seem to be connected with the events of early ages; others seem to be ephemerides, and relate to celestial phenomena, as in astrological works; while others, again, appear to be geographical or ethnological enumerations. One chapter that we have translated is devoted to a series of customs, specifying those people who were wont to practise them. The whole forms a subject of the highest importance for students of the ethnography of past times.

If, for instance, we examine chapter 30 (of which I recently gave a translation to the Royal Asiatic Society with philological commentary), we shall see a hieroglyphic having the sounds "lœp" and "dip," of which the earliest representation is a horned mammal, described in the first line of the text as "a cow," and then come six other lists of characters of which no sort of connected sense could be made, as may be seen from the great discrepancies in translation offered by those who have sought to arrive at their meaning. But these characters exactly represent the very complete series of the different meanings of the hieroglyphic expressed phonetically, and of which a great part are yet attributed to the same character. Many of these, however, are unknown in Chinese literature, though they are expressed in its vocabulary by the same phonetic type. These lists are broken up here and there by formulas of augury, "lucky" and "unlucky," notably by words such as *Lœh dœnk* and *dœnk-kœ*, which singularly enough recall the formulas *la-dunku* and *dunku*, preserved in the cuneiform astrological tablets.

The corresponding hieroglyphic in Akkadian writing, which is identical in form, and which signifies "ox," has the sounds of "lup" and "dip." The fragments of dictionaries, better

known under the name of syllabaries, some of which are yet unpublished and unedited, and which Mr. T. G. Pinches has kindly consented to collect for me, furnish an incomplete list of the same meanings. In one of the syllabaries, six or eight lines, containing as many significations of this same character, are missing; but, happily, among those that have been found on other cuneiform tablets, figure those which, while indicated in the lists of the Yh King, are wanting to the same hieroglyphic in Chinese literature. The accuracy of our discovery is yet further proved by the composed characters in the two writings.

To summarise. Certain portions of the Yh King are only lists of meanings that pointedly recall the Akkadian cuneiform syllabaries, and which belong to one dialect of the same family, and we shall see, by an example, up to what point of identity this resemblance consists. The imagination has here wide scope to supply the lines that are missing, and it is hard not to try and foresee that which would confirm us from the new discoveries in Chaldea.

The syllabaries on which we have founded our examples only date from the 12th century B.C.; it is true, they are exactly copied from those of the ancient library, compiled by order of Saryukin, king of Agadé, in the sixteenth century before our era. As to the precise degree in which these syllabaries are an abridgement from still earlier ones we know nothing. But after our investigations, and after the occurrence in the early Chinese lists of meanings and expressions found in the Assyrian texts, and which do not figure at all in the syllabaries, we may be led to believe that there were lists in every way far more complete than those which have come down to us, and it is to be hoped that new discoveries may serve to confirm this theory.

All this, of necessity, implies an early relationship between Chinese and Chaldean culture, around which we shall yet group several curious facts drawn from the old sources of semi-historic Chinese tradition.

We do not look on the progressive development

of civilisation in China. The first chiefs and their ministers were in possession of most of the arts and sciences. They were only concerned in installing themselves in the country, and in forming relations with the populations, or in organising an administration upon a plan fixed beforehand, or in conformity with an earlier experience.

All the inventions, astronomy, music, medicine, as well as all the arts that add to the comfort and the well-being of mankind, are attributed to the legendary group of Nai Hoang-ti and his ministers. Under Yao and Shun there are questions as to the titles of officers which have never met with any explanations to this day, and which remain problems.

Hoang-ti (originally pronounced Kon-ti), according to legendary tradition, was the first of the five emperors who reigned at the dawn of history. His family name was *Nai* (originally *Nan* or *Nak*). If we examine the ancient form of his name, as it is shown in the old Chinese palæographic collections, we shall find that it is made up of a single group, pronounced Nak-kon-ti, a name which coincides strangely with Nakhunta or Nakhunte, mentioned in the Susian texts as the chief of the gods. His name was added to theirs by the early kings of this region. Kudur Nakhunta, King of Susa, came down to the plains of the Euphrates, ravaged the country, seized upon the towns extending from Ur as far as Babylon, and founded in about the year 2285 B.C., the dynasty that, according to Berosus, is called Median.

The same records tell us that the inventor of writing was Ts'ang Hieh, whose name, according to ancient Chinese, was pronounced *Dum-Kit*. This man is said by some to have been an independent chief; others have described him as coming to the throne after the fabulous Fuh-hi; while others, again, have termed him one of *Nakonti's* ministers. The resemblance between his name, Dum-Kit, and that which Dungi, King of Ur, later on certainly bore, for the same reason that the surname Nakhunta was given to all the kings of Susa, is curious; and our interest in the comparison reaches a higher pitch when it is seen that the Akkadian

characters forming the name of Dungi, mean "the man of the bamboo tablet," and that that of the two Chinese characters with which his name was written in the earliest times was "carver of wood."

Tsoh Kieu Ming, a disciple of Confucius, has preserved in his *Tsoh chuan* a tradition reported to him by the sage himself, and which, bearing on the subject of writing, seems worthy of general attention.

"In days of yore Hoang-ti used signs in the form of clouds (Yün) in order to record facts.

"Yen-ti made use of signs in the shape of tongues of fire in order to record facts."

But may not these signs in the form of clouds possibly be taken to mean shadows of the objects? *Yen-ti*, in old Chinese *Din-ti*, is the surname of *Lieh Shan*, in old Chinese *Lik-tan*. In this have we not a far-off likeness to the celebrated *Liktiam* (Lik bagas, Lik babi), the earliest known King of Ur, who has covered the whole of Chaldæa with his monuments, while *Din-ti* recalls singularly enough the aged seer of Babylon, *Din-tir*. And those tongues of fire that he was wont to use, may they not be the cuneiform characters?

As regards the political institutions of primitive China, in the fragments of Susian history as far as they have come to light, we find some explanations upon two points that have hitherto defied the research of students, whether natives or foreigners. In the second chapter of the "Shu King," we learn that the Emperor Shun (2255-2205 B.C.) gave daily "audiences to all the pastors," a term that is understood to apply to the princes of the various States. In another passage it is said that he made special sacrifice, but with the ordinary rites to God, and with purity and respect to the "Six Honoured ones." The epithet "pastors" applies to the Princes, and the term "Six Honoured ones" have been the subject of many commentaries, without, however, any satisfactory result having been arrived at. But we see from the Susian texts that

the word for "Prince" had the meaning of "Pastor," and that in the Divine hierarchy immediately after the chief deity were six gods of inferior rank.

An officer of high grade, whom Yao and Shun consulted, and who seems to have played an active part in the regulation of the affairs of the Government, bears the title of Chief of the Four Mountains. This strange name would seem to have reference to a yet recent reminiscence of the famous title of "King of the Four Regions," which was one borne, as is well known, by the Chaldean sovereign.

One of Yao's first tasks was to divide his dominions into twelve sections, presided over by the same number of chiefs; this is absolutely like the duodenary feudal system adopted in Susa. We know that to Yao is attributed, and with the greatest probability, the establishment of the cycle of sixty years, the length of the year, of months, and the intercalary month.

The names of the four cardinal points, and, what is very remarkable, the hieroglyphic signs by which they are expressed, are, in a certain measure, the same in the Akkadian and Chinese cultures. This I intend to show in a special monograph upon the subject; but that which is here of importance to note is the displacement of the geographical horizon produced in the establishing of the "hundred families." The South, which was so termed on the cuneiform tablets, corresponds in Chinese to the East, the North to the West, the East to the South, making thus a displacement of quarter of a circle. It would be interesting if, on examination of the Akkadian and Assyrian names, we could find that they, in their turn, denoted an early displacement, of which only these traces remain to us.

In the present day in China, the left hand, that is the west, is held to be auspicious, and is looked upon as the place of honour. On the other hand, in early Chinese, just as in Chaldee, it was the right that was so regarded.

The eight Kwa of Fuh-hi recal, in a singular manner, the arrows of divination that are almost

always eight in number, and which, as the Babylonian Assyrian cylinders show us, are held in the hand of Marduk and of Istar. These are shaped in the form of a circular fan, and exactly answer to the description given by the Mussulman authors in their account of the heathen Kaabah rites; their disposition is precisely that of the eight Kwa which Fu-hi holds in his hand, in the well-known ancient Chinese portrait of him.

Belomancy was much practised by the Chaldeans. And I would remind you of the curious passage in Ezekiel, where the prophet states that Nabuchodorossor, before setting out for the war, and while yet hesitating as to the proper point where he should attack the foe, put arrows unsorted into a quiver, after having written on each, according to the commentary of S. Jerome, the name of one of his adversaries, in order to see which one would come out first, and consequently which town it was that he ought to attack. This same belomancy is still practised among the Arabs, and was very prevalent in Mecca at the time of Mahomed.

According to Mussulman writers, seven arrows without points or feathers, and each bearing a significant word, were preserved in the Kaábah, under the guardianship of a special minister.

We cannot here examine how far it would be possible to re-discover and to group the traces existing in this Akkadian character of an older method of writing, either invented or imported by a people of a different race; a writing, doubtless, incomplete and coarse, and certainly figurative, but which met with its perfection in the Akkadian centre, with which it became wholly assimilated, and upon which it has left its indelible stamp. It is the writing itself which yields us knowledge, respecting certain physical characteristics of the people, by whom it was at last systematised. Thus, the hieroglyphics still preserved in China, show us, from the peculiar outline of the nose, when seen full face, that that member must have been usually quite flat. Unfortunately, this symbol cannot be compared with the Akkadian character, for this, we believe, is not yet known.

The obliquity of the eyes is illustrated by many examples in the simple and composed characters, in the Kuwen of old China. And the two linear outlines which, in Akkadian, denote the eye (outlines that have been clearly misunderstood), seem with every probability to confirm the same fact.

In the lectures given by the talented Professor Sayce, some two years back, on Babylonian literature, he made allusion to the oblique-eyed population of Babylon. The learned Assyriologist was kind enough to inform me that he had come to this opinion, after an examination of the figures represented on archaic cylinders, but that the dwarfed and clumsy outline of these figures should not rank as proof, since the acquisition by the British Museum authorities of the statuettes of Gudea, Viceroy of Zirghoul. The type of this personage is, indeed, a different one, though it may not be Semitic; yet it seems to us that it cannot be invoked in matters concerning the type of the higher populations of Elam. The bronze statuettes of this monarch represent him in a singular posture, doubtless sacred, for the accomplishment of some traditional rite, for he is shown kneeling upon some special kind of support that is lost to-day, and made, probably, of some different kind of substance, and in his hands he holds an enormous bludgeon, broad at the top and narrow at the base, but of which the point, though unfortunately broken, is yet sufficiently indicated. The form of this tapering staff recals that of those cones of baked clay that were probably designed for some religious rites, and of which the most bear inscriptions of this same Gudea. On the larger part, there is a kind of border, from which, as Mr. T. G. Pinches shrewdly observes, they were probably intended to hang point downwards. Such precaution, if we compare it with the kneeling posture of Gudea, would seem to indicate a special veneration, a great respect, for this point. From a hieroglyphic preserved in China, we may get an explanation of this. As is known, the hieroglyphic sign for father in Chinese *ku-wen*, more or less faithfully imitated in modern writing, passing by the intermediate styles,

ta-chuan, *siao-chuan*, and *li-shu*, represents the right hand grasping, or, rather, exhibiting an object delineated by a stroke sometimes thick at the top and fine at the bottom, and *vice versa*, just according to the interpretation put upon it by the scribe, whether "stick" or "flame," between which the etymological traditions concerning it are divided. May not these two traditions, as is so often the case in China, both be correct? do they not each represent a part of the truth? Without entering into the question as to whether the affinity of the name Gudea with the ancient reading of the Chinese hieroglyphic *Gut*, which is still preserved with the special meaning of dead father, be purely accidental, or whether it is likely that the two names may have had one common origin, we are led to believe that the Chinese hieroglyphic, the bordered cones, and the attitude of Gudea holding his stake, all serve to explain each other. This cone of wood may almost certainly be taken to mean the generator of fire, like the *pramantha* of the vedic hymns of which, as M. Boscawen shows, the use in religion was known among the Akkadians. It must yet be insisted that in the statuette there is much wanting to admit of our drawing any conclusions as to the physique of the Akkadians of the higher classes. It belongs to an epoch subsequent to the predominance of the Turanian element, and seems to argue a growth of the Mongol and of the semitic types.

We could enumerate a long series of affinities between Chaldean culture and Chinese civilisation, although the last was not borrowed directly.

From what evidence we have, it seems highly probable that a certain number of families or of tribes, without any apparent generic name, but among which the Kutta filled an important position, came to China about the year 2500 B.C. These tribes, which came from the west, were obliged to quit the neighbourhood, probably north of the Susiana, and were comprised in the feudal agglomeration of that region, where they must have been influenced by the Akkado-Chaldean culture.

The numeric formalism which plays so great a

part in all Chinese conceptions, which penetrates their ideas, their customs, their institutions of every kind, is notoriously of Chaldean origin. Although, however, on this point there is yet much to be learnt, and although we must wait for the revelations of those Assyriologists who are now at pains to decipher the tablets relating to the sacred numbers that have been added to the collection in the British Museum by a well-known modern Assyrian, Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, yet we may already see how great, how important, was the use of these numerical categories in the cosmogony, the institutions, and the speculations of the ancient Chaldeans. Of them all, the numbers twelve, seven, and six are chiefly remarkable.

I will not trespass further upon your patience by citing the vast number of affinities already pointed out by learned men, such as Davies, Chalmers, and Schlegel, between a host of our customs, our sciences, our arts, our superstitions, our games, and those of the subjects of the Son of Heaven. A portion of these are certainly owing to their progress, as also to communication and to ulterior changes, but another portion, perhaps the earliest and most important, traces its origin to the first establishment in ancient China of a part of that primitive Akkado-Chaldean culture to which our modern civilisation is indirectly so referable.

The Chinese recognise only five colours, and these they attribute to the planets properly so called. Colours, however, are very likely to have been changed in the transmission of the theory of the planets from one country to another. Thus, we find our countryman Lilly, who wrote on astrology about 1644, giving both the Chaldee and Chinese colour of Jupiter. "Jupiter governeth all infirmities of the liver; of colours seagreen or blue, a mixt yellow or green." But what is singular is, that Lilly agrees with the Chinese not only as to the colour, but even the taste (!) of the planets, and their influence on the liver, spleen, &c. "Saturn is cold and dry, melancholic, earthly." "Mars, in nature, hot and dry; he delighteth in red colour, and in those savour which are bitter, sharp, and burn the tongue." "Venus, in colours

she is white." "Mercure, in the elements he is the water."

From this long and dry survey of some of the characteristics of the language, writings, and customs of the Chinese empire, we are led to strongly protest against the sort of exclusiveness in which history has up to now left it, and also to claim for the history of China the rank due to such a nation, and for its language a place in one of the classifications already accepted in the general linguistic.

The discovery of a foreign origin in the rudiments of their civilisation, oddly enough, confirms the opinion asserted so many times that want of originality and of imagination is one of the characteristics of the Yellow race. We mean in no way to reproach them with their want of imagination. This, in our own opinion, contributes but little towards real happiness. By their conservative spirit, their respect for old customs, their parental love, their life cast in that of their forefathers, the Chinese have resolved the long-sought-for problem of a life without cares, without want of comfort, which would be relative happiness to the majority of the human race. But the best of things have an end, and, even in China, a change must come.

We have alluded, in the early part of this lecture, to the laws governing the *different* agglomerations of the human race, and have said the turning point has arrived for the Chinese. The symptoms are visible.

The two and half centuries of reign of the Mandchoue dynasty have opened a new era, and many literary works have been published indicating a freedom of thought and a facility of appreciation little dreamt of from what we know of the Chinese genius. If the Jesuits had not been hindered by the dogmatical ideas, and perhaps by the ill-feelings of the Dominicans, the work they began so many years ago would now bear fruits, and the transformation China is compelled to undergo sooner or later would have come naturally, and without the costly and sudden changes which we much fear in future.

The Jesuits, with their usual cleverness, had foreseen the judicious concessions to be made to ancient traditions in China, so as to frame them to our preconceived European views of truth and justice.

When European science, coming to aid their controversialist tastes, shows them what is true and what is false, what is genuine, and what is apocryphal in their divination books; when they see, by the necessity of an army, that literary studies are not sufficient to make good soldiers, shall we then be ready to answer their questions, and direct them in the right path? It is in the nature of such conservative nations, when once the object of their worship has vanished, to seize upon any new worship that is offered to their religious feelings.

We must teach our young scholars the different dialects, so as to prepare them for the new field which will shortly be opened to their activity, and it is, therefore, our duty to make Chinese translations of our European books.

If an important event, long foreseen, such as a change in the dynasty, or some governmental influence, were to come suddenly upon us, a collapse in the tribes forming this immense empire would be almost sure to occur, and the several ports now open to our trade would form centres of commercial influence. This would be an opportunity that we should not miss. It would be the duty of the Government to watch the change; but it is left to society at large to encourage the study of the modern Chinese dialects, and also of Chinese archeology, philosophy, &c., and thus fill up a long felt want in England, namely, the foundation of a school especially adapted to the teaching of the Oriental languages, as, of all nations, England has the greatest interest to keep a watchful eye on China and her future.

London, May 14, 1880.

W. TROUNCE, PRINTER, GOUGH-SQUARE, FLEET-STREET, E.C.

00032322

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018